

Pionic Matrix Elements in Neutrinoless Double- β Decay

Martin J. Savage

Department of Physics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195
and Jefferson Lab., 12000 Jefferson Avenue, Newport News, Virginia 23606
 savage@phys.washington.edu

Abstract

Physics beyond the standard model of electroweak interactions that violates lepton number will, in general, induce operators involving the quark and lepton fields that violate lepton number. I point out that some matrix elements of particular operators are known. In the limit of exact SU(3) flavor symmetry the operator $\bar{u}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)d\bar{u}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)d$ is part of the **27** representation responsible for $\Delta I = \frac{3}{2}$ strangeness changing decays in the standard model. At leading order in the chiral expansion there is only one coupling constant that describes the weak interactions of the pseudo-Goldstone bosons induced by the **27** representation. The observed branching fraction for $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^0$ determines this coupling constant. Contributions of the form $m_s \log m_s$ are used to estimate SU(3) breaking corrections to the relation between $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^0$ and the $\pi^- \rightarrow \pi^+e^-e^-$ interaction.

November 1998

Observation of neutrinoless double- β decay ($\beta\beta_{0\nu}$) between two nuclei, $(A, Z) \rightarrow (A, Z + 2) + e^- + e^-$, would provide unambiguous evidence of physics beyond the standard model, due to the explicit violation lepton number. Ongoing experimental efforts to find evidence for such transitions have so far been unsuccessful. While cleanly observing the lepton number conserving two-neutrino ($\beta\beta_{2\nu}$) mode $(A, Z) \rightarrow (A, Z + 2) + e^- + e^- + \bar{\nu}_e + \bar{\nu}_e$ that arises at second order in the weak interaction, only lower limits on the lifetime for the neutrinoless process $(A, Z) \rightarrow (A, Z + 2) + e^- + e^-$ have been presented (for a recent review see [1]).

Forming theoretical predictions for the rate of both the $\beta\beta_{2\nu}$ and $\beta\beta_{0\nu}$ decay processes presents challenges in many areas. The underlying physics responsible for $\beta\beta_{2\nu}$ decays is (in the standard model) simply two charged current weak interactions, dominated by operators involving only the *up* and *down* quarks. The matrix element of each of these weak interactions in the nucleon and pion are well known from ordinary β -decay and therefore the challenge arises in forming the nuclear matrix elements of the time-ordered product of these two weak interaction. Predictions of nuclear model calculations for these $\beta\beta_{2\nu}$ decay rates tend to vary by factors ~ 5 [3–14].

In contrast, physics beyond the standard model that might give rise to lepton number non-conservation is unknown. Its existence, origin and structure can only be speculated. Extensive theoretical study in this area has focused on lepton number violation in the neutrino mass matrix, and in particular lepton number violating interactions inserted into the propagator of very light neutrinos (an excellent review by Haxton and Stephenson can be found in [2]). While one expects insertions of the lowest dimension operators to make the dominant contribution, it is possible that significant lepton number violation occurs via the exchange of heavy particles. At low energies, such exchanges will induce local operators involving the quark and lepton fields of the standard model. Historically, specific models such as left-right-symmetric models [15], supersymmetry with R-parity violation [16], or other lepton number violating extensions to the standard model [17], have been examined. The lepton number violating operators resulting from such scenarios have been determined perturbatively in the short-distance coupling constants. It is perhaps not surprising that difficulties arise in evaluating the hadronic matrix elements of the resulting operators between nucleon and pion fields. Factorization has been extensively employed to estimate the hadronic matrix elements of multi-quark operators. However, it is highly desirable to make more reliable estimates. In addition, the difficulties encountered in evaluating the nuclear matrix elements of $\beta\beta_{2\nu}$ decays must still be dealt with in evaluating the rates for $\beta\beta_{0\nu}$ processes.

In this work I point out the matrix element of a certain operator structure can be related to the amplitudes for $\Delta I = \frac{3}{2}$ processes in the SU(3) limit. Restricting ourselves to discussions of operators involving four quark fields and two electron fields, the most general lepton number violating operator involving electrons and first generation quarks is

$$\mathcal{O}^{\Delta L=2} = \bar{u}\Gamma_q d \ \bar{u}\Gamma_q d \ \bar{e}\Gamma_l e^c \quad , \quad (1)$$

where e^c is the charge conjugate electron field, Γ_l is the lorentz structure responsible for the lepton interaction and Γ_q is the lorentz structure responsible for the quark interaction. Of the many forms of Γ_q , matrix elements of operators with $\Gamma_q = \gamma_\mu(1 - \gamma_5)$ or $\gamma_\mu(1 + \gamma_5)$ can be related by SU(3) symmetry to matrix elements of

$$\mathcal{O}^{\Delta S=1} = \bar{u}\gamma_\mu(1 - \gamma_5)s \ \bar{d}\gamma^\mu(1 - \gamma_5)u \quad , \quad (2)$$

that arises in the standard model.

In the standard model the exchange of a single W -gauge boson induces an effective lagrange density

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}^{\Delta s=1} &= -\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{us}V_{ud}^* \bar{u}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)s \bar{d}\gamma^\mu(1-\gamma_5)u + \dots \\ &= -\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{us}V_{ud}^* \left[C^{(\mathbf{8})}(M_W)\mathcal{O}^{(\mathbf{8})}(M_W) + C^{(\mathbf{27})}(M_W)\mathcal{O}^{(\mathbf{27})}(M_W) \right] ,\end{aligned}\quad (3)$$

where the ellipsis denote higher dimension operators suppressed by powers of the W -boson mass. G_F is Fermi's coupling constant and V_{ij} is the element of the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) weak mixing matrix between quarks of flavor i and j . Under $SU(3)$ flavor symmetry $\mathcal{L}^{\Delta s=1}$ can be decomposed into operators, $\mathcal{O}^{(\mathbf{8})}$ and $\mathcal{O}^{(\mathbf{27})}$, that transform as $\mathbf{8} \oplus \mathbf{27}$ respectively. The coefficients of the operators, $C^{(\mathbf{8})}(\mu)$ and $C^{(\mathbf{27})}(\mu)$, are renormalized at the scale μ . It is well known that these irreducible representations are renormalized differently by the strong interaction, with the $\mathbf{8}$ being enhanced in the infrared while the $\mathbf{27}$ is suppressed. The $\mathbf{27}$ is not renormalized by penguin-type contributions, and in scaling between renormalization scales μ and μ' one finds in the leading log approximation

$$C^{(\mathbf{27})}(\mu') = C^{(\mathbf{27})}(\mu) \left[\frac{\alpha_s(\mu')}{\alpha_s(\mu)} \right]^{-\frac{2}{b}}, \quad (4)$$

where $b = 11 - \frac{2}{3}N_f$ with N_f being the number of active quarks between the scales μ and μ' and $\alpha_s(\mu)$ is the strong interaction coupling constant at the scale μ .

In flavor space, suppressing strong interaction indices, the operator $\mathcal{O}^{(\mathbf{27})}$ is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{O}^{(\mathbf{27})} &= T_{cd}^{ab} \bar{q}^c \gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)q_a \bar{q}^d \gamma^\mu(1-\gamma_5)q_b \\ T_{12}^{13} &= T_{21}^{13} = T_{12}^{31} = T_{21}^{31} = \frac{1}{5}, \quad T_{22}^{23} = T_{22}^{32} = T_{32}^{33} = T_{23}^{33} = -\frac{1}{10},\end{aligned}\quad (5)$$

and when renormalized at the weak scale ($\mu = M_W$) its Wilson coefficient is $C^{(\mathbf{27})}(M_W) = 1$. Under chiral $SU(3)_L \otimes SU(3)_R$ chiral transformations the tensor T transforms as $T_{cd}^{ab} \rightarrow L_\alpha^a L_\beta^b T_{\sigma\rho}^{\alpha\beta} L_c^\dagger L_d^\dagger$, and matrix elements of $\mathcal{O}^{(\mathbf{27})}$ between meson states are reproduced by an effective lagrange density (at leading order)

$$\langle \pi' s | C^{(\mathbf{27})}(M_W) \mathcal{O}^{(\mathbf{27})}(M_W) | \pi' s \rangle = \langle \pi' s | g^{(\mathbf{27})} f_\pi^4 T_{cd}^{ab} \left(\Sigma \partial_\mu \Sigma^\dagger \right)_a^c \left(\Sigma \partial^\mu \Sigma^\dagger \right)_b^d + \dots | \pi' s \rangle, \quad (6)$$

where $f_\pi = 131$ MeV is the pion decay constant. The ellipsis denote operators involving more derivatives acting on the meson field and insertions of the light quark mass matrix. Σ is the exponential of the pseudo-Goldstone boson field,

$$\Sigma = \exp \left(\frac{2i}{f_\pi} M \right), \quad M = \begin{pmatrix} \pi^0/\sqrt{2} + \eta/\sqrt{6} & \pi^+ & K^+ \\ \pi^- & -\pi^0/\sqrt{2} + \eta/\sqrt{6} & K^0 \\ K^- & \bar{K}^0 & -2/\sqrt{6}\eta \end{pmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

The experimentally observed rate for $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ fixes $g^{(\mathbf{27})} = 0.12$ (see [18]) in the limit of $SU(3)$ symmetry¹ while naive dimensional analysis would suggest $g^{(\mathbf{27})} \sim 1$. This suppression is part of the $\Delta I = \frac{1}{2}$ rule one finds in $\Delta s = 1$ decays.

¹Our definitions of f_π and T_{cd}^{ab} lead to $g^{(\mathbf{27})}$ being a factor of $\frac{3}{4}$ smaller than that used in [18].

Below the scale of physics responsible for lepton number violation Λ , one may find an $\Delta L = 2$ effective lagrange density involving the quark and lepton fields of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{\beta\beta} &= C_{\beta\beta}(\Lambda) \bar{u}\gamma_\mu(1 - \gamma_5)d \bar{u}\gamma^\mu(1 - \gamma_5)d \bar{e}\Gamma_l e^c(\Lambda) \\ &= C_{\beta\beta}(\Lambda) T_{cd}^{ab} \bar{q}^c\gamma_\mu(1 - \gamma_5)q_a \bar{q}^d\gamma^\mu(1 - \gamma_5)q_b \bar{e}\Gamma_l e^c(\Lambda) \\ T_{11}^{22} &= 1 \quad .\end{aligned}\tag{8}$$

This operator transforms is a component of the **27** of SU(3), and SU(3) symmetry relates matrix elements of this operator to those of the $\mathcal{O}^{(27)}$ in eq. (5). The effective lagrange density that reproduces matrix elements between meson states is found from eq. (6) to be

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{\beta\beta} &\rightarrow C_{\beta\beta}(M_W) g^{(27)} f_\pi^4 \bar{e}\Gamma_l e^c \left(\Sigma\partial_\mu\Sigma^\dagger\right)_2^1 \left(\Sigma\partial^\mu\Sigma^\dagger\right)_2^1 + \dots \\ &= -4 C_{\beta\beta}(M_W) g^{(27)} f_\pi^2 \bar{e}\Gamma_l e^c \left[\partial_\mu\pi^-\partial^\mu\pi^- \right. \\ &\quad \left. - i\frac{2\sqrt{2}}{f} \left(\partial_\mu\pi^-\partial^\mu\pi^-\pi^0 - \partial_\mu\pi^-\partial^\mu\pi^0\pi^-\right) + \dots\right] \quad ,\end{aligned}\tag{9}$$

where the ellipsis denote operators involving more powers of the pion field and also contributions from higher dimension operators. The coefficient renormalized at the weak scale is related to the coefficient at Λ in the leading log approximation by

$$C_{\beta\beta}(M_W) = C_{\beta\beta}(\Lambda) \left[\frac{\alpha_s(M_W)}{\alpha_s(M_t)}\right]^{-\frac{6}{23}} \left[\frac{\alpha_s(M_t)}{\alpha_s(\Lambda)}\right]^{-\frac{2}{7}} \quad ,\tag{10}$$

assuming that $\Lambda \gg m_t$ with m_t the top quark mass. Naive dimensional analysis suggests that $C_{\beta\beta}(\Lambda) \sim \Lambda^{-5}$. In this evolution we have neglected the contributions from the electroweak sector and only considered strong interaction corrections.

The inclusion of SU(3) breaking effects into the determination of $g^{(27)}$ and its relation to the $\beta\beta_{0\nu}$ matrix elements is expected to lead to modifications at the 30% level. A better estimate can be obtained from contributions of the form $m_s \log m_s$ arising from kaon and eta meson loops in the chiral expansion. A straightforward calculation gives

$$g_{\pi^-\pi^-}^{(27)} = g_{K^+\pi^+\pi^0}^{(27)} \left[1 - \frac{M_K^2}{16\pi^2 f_\pi^2} \log\left(\frac{M_K^2}{\Lambda_\chi^2}\right) + \dots\right] \quad ,\tag{11}$$

where we have chosen to renormalize at the chiral symmetry breaking scale $\Lambda_\chi \sim 1$ GeV. The ellipsis denote terms higher order in the chiral expansion, such as local counterterms of the form m_s and other such terms. In arriving at eq. (11) we have used the Gell-Mann–Okubo mass relation between the pion, kaon and eta meson masses and neglected the pion mass. Inserting the appropriate constants into eq. (11) gives an enhancement of $g_{\pi^-\pi^-}^{(27)}$ over $g_{K^+\pi^+\pi^0}^{(27)}$ of about 12%. This should be taken as an estimate only, as we expect local counterterms to make contributions of roughly this size, as is the case for the relation between f_K and f_π .

If instead of left-handed interactions, the short-distance theory gave rise to right-handed interactions, $\Gamma_q = \gamma_\mu(1 + \gamma_5)$, then

$$\mathcal{L}_{\beta\beta}^R \rightarrow C_{\beta\beta}(M_W) g^{(27)} f_\pi^4 \bar{e}\Gamma_l e^c \left(\Sigma^\dagger\partial_\mu\Sigma\right)_2^1 \left(\Sigma^\dagger\partial^\mu\Sigma\right)_2^1 + \dots \quad ,\tag{12}$$

with the same value of $g^{(\mathbf{27})}$ due to the parity invariance of the strong interaction.

Therefore, given that we can compute $C_{\beta\beta}(\Lambda)$ in any given theory of the short-distance physics, we can normalize the matrix element for processes involving the pseudo-Goldstone bosons alone. These processes are suppressed by the same strong interaction corrections that suppress the $\Delta I = \frac{3}{2}$ decays of the standard model. To be consistent with chiral symmetry, the matrix element between pion states involves two derivatives at leading order, and therefore for pions with vanishing four-momentum this source of lepton number violation vanishes. At higher orders in the chiral expansion momentum independent terms will arise through insertions of the light quark mass matrix.

The nonleptonic decay of octet baryons proceeding via the $\mathbf{27}$ representation are described at leading order by the effective lagrange density

$$\mathcal{L}_B = \beta_{27} \frac{G_F m_\pi^2 f_\pi}{\sqrt{2}} T_{cd}^{ab} \left(\xi \bar{B} \xi^\dagger \right)_a^c \left(\xi B \xi^\dagger \right)_b^d, \quad (13)$$

where $\Sigma = \xi^2$. The best fit to the available data gives $\beta_{27} \sim -0.16$, but with large uncertainties, as determined in [18]. Inserting the tensor structure for $\beta\beta_{0\nu}$ decay in Eq. (8), gives a contribution to $\Sigma^- \rightarrow \Sigma^+ e^- e^-$, but does not contribute to processes involving the nucleons, due to isospin considerations (the $\beta\beta_{0\nu}$ operator has $(\Delta I, \Delta I_Z) = (2, +2)$). Therefore there are no momentum independent operators involving a single nucleon and multiple pions, in the chiral limit. The first non-zero amplitudes involve the momentum of the pions, or insertions of the light quark mass matrix. The momentum dependent interactions have been discussed previously (e.g. [2,3,9,10]). However, the present experimental determinations of the nonleptonic amplitudes are not precise enough to constrain these higher dimension operators.

In order for two s-wave nucleons to scatter via the $\beta\beta_{0\nu}$ interaction they must be in the $^1S_0$ -channel, and therefore in a $\mathbf{27} \oplus \mathbf{8}$ of $SU(3)$. The effective operators that contribute to the nonleptonic and $\beta\beta_{0\nu}$ interaction are found by forming all singlets from $(\mathbf{27} \oplus \mathbf{8}) \otimes \mathbf{27} \otimes (\mathbf{27} \oplus \mathbf{8})$. At present there are no firm determinations of any $\Delta I = \frac{3}{2}$, $\Delta s = 1$ four-baryon weak interactions, and therefore we are unable constrain the coupling constants of these interactions. More precise measurements of the properties and decay patterns of hypernuclei would improve the situation (e.g. [19] and references therein).

Therefore, we have shown that the hadronic matrix elements between pion states of operators that may contribute to $\beta\beta_{0\nu}$ decay can be normalized to the rate for $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ in the limit of $SU(3)$ symmetry. Unfortunately, the current precision of data from hyperon decays and from hypernuclei does not allow for constraints to be placed on the interactions involving one or more nucleons.

This work was stimulated by a nice talk given by Petr Vogel at the DNP meeting in Santa Fe. I would like to thank Petr Vogel and Wick Haxton for interesting discussions. This work is supported in part by the U.S. Dept. of Energy under Grants No. DE-FG03-97ER41014.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Morales, [hep-ph/9809540](#).
- [2] W.C. Haxton and G.J. Stephenson, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **12**, 409 (1984).
- [3] J.D. Vergados, *Phys. Rev. C* **24**, 640 (1981); *Nucl. Phys. B* **218**, 109 (1983).
- [4] W.C. Haxton, G.J. Stephenson Jr., D. Strottman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **47**, 153 (1981); *Phys. Rev. D* **25**, 2360 (1982); W.C. Haxton, *Comments Nucl. Part. Phys.* **11**, 41 (1983); J. Engel, W.C. Haxton and P. Vogel, *Phys. Rev. C* **46**, 2153 (1992); W.C. Haxton, *Nucl. Phys. B* **31c**, 82 (1993).
- [5] M. Doi, T. Kotani and E. Takasugi, *Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.* **83**, 1 (1985). M. Doi, T. Kotani, H. Nishiura and E. Takasugi, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **69**, 602 (1983); *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **70**, 1353 (1983).
- [6] E. Caurier *et al.*, *Phys. Lett. B* **252**, 13 (1990); *Phys. Rev. C* **50**, 223 (1994); *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 1954 (1996).
- [7] J. Retamosa *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. C* **51**, 371 (1995).
- [8] J. Engel, S. Pittel and P. Vogel, *Phys. Rev. C* **38**, 2971 (1988); A. Griffiths and P. Vogel, *Phys. Rev. C* **46**, 181 (1992); M. Moe and P. Vogel, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **44**, 247 (1994); M. Ericson, T. Ericson and P. Vogel, *Phys. Lett. B* **328**, 259 (1994); A. Poves *et al.*, *Phys. Lett. B* **361**, 1 (1995); A. Balyish *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 5186 (1996); P.B. Radha *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 2642 (1996).
- [9] F. Simkovic, A. Faessler, G. Pantis and J.D. Vergados, *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **48**, 257 (1996) and references therein.
- [10] A. Staudt, T.T.S. Kuo, H.V. Klapdor-Kleingrothaus, *Phys. Rev. C* **46**, 871 (1992) and references therein.
- [11] J. Suhonen *et al.*, *Phys. Rep.* **300**, 123 (1998).
- [12] X.R. Wu *et al.*, *Phys. Lett. B* **272**, 169 (1991); *Phys. Lett. B* **276**, 274 (1992);
- [13] J.G. Hirsch *et al.*, *Nucl. Phys. A* **589**, 445 (1995).
- [14] J. Abad, A. Morales, R. Nunez-Lagos and A.F. Pasheco, *Ann. Fis. A* **80**, 9 (1984); JPC **45s**, 147 (1984).
- [15] R. N. Mohapatra, [hep-ph/9808284](#), and references therein.
- [16] A. Faessler, S. Kovalenko, F. Simkovic and J. Schwieger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 183 (1997). A. Faessler, S. Kovalenko and F. Simkovic, *Phys. Rev. D* **58**, 1154 (1998).
- [17] Y. Chkashige, R.N. Mohapatra and R.D. Peccei, *Phys. Lett. B* **98**, 265 (1981).
- [18] A.A. El-Hady, J. Tandean and G. Valencia, [hep-ph/9808322](#).
- [19] A. Parreno, A. Ramos, and C. Bennhold, *Phys. Rev. C* **56**, 339 (1997).